



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,480	04/21/2004	John Lair	64337.000002	7194
21967	7590 07/01/2005		EXAM	INER
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			CAI, WAYNE HUU	
	TREET, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1200			2681	
WASHING	FON, DC 20006-1109		DATE MAIL ED: 07/01/2006	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s) LAIR, JOHN	
Advisory Action	10/828,480		
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wayne Cai	2681	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
REPLY FILED 10 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION	N FOR ALLOWANCE.	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 10 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO			
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. Other:			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to arguments of claims 1, 6, 15-16, 18, 23, 26, 28-29, and 32, even though Lenz does not show the wireless transmission of a transmit mode signal. Lenz, however, expressly shows the wired transmission of a transmit mode signal. Inherently, in a "push-to-talk" feature, there must be two separate mode, a transmit mode and a receive mode. It literrally means that "push" to talk or to transmit the signal to the other end. Also, it is obvious to one skill in the art to modify between wired and wireless headset. Furthermore, one skill in the art would know that the information in communications in the short range between the wireless headset and the device is a packetized digital information (i.e., Bluetooth...).

In response to arguments of claims 3, 11, 34, the Examiner again disagrees with the arguments because in fig. 1, it shows that the button 24 is positioned on the microphone assembly, or substantially coaxially with the ear insert. Even if Lenz does not show that the switch is positioned on the microphone assembly, the disposition of the switch does not affect the functionalities of the headset. Hence, it is not novel.

In response to arguments of claims 7-12, the cited references (e.g. Lenz (US - 5,101,504), Bae (US - 6,795,718 B2), and Hahn (US - 6,230,029)) disclose different types of headset communication device. In addition, Bae discloses the comfortable material is being used for the wireless headset (see col. 4, lines 26-46). Evidently, various types of headsets are being used prior to the claimed invention.

ERIKA A. GARY) RIMARY EXAMINER

Tupeliniar